DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 209 274 TM 810 767

AUTHOR Marble, W. O., Jr.
TITLE An Evaluation of the Professional Development Sequence on "The Slow Learner in the Secondary School".
INSTITUTION Burnaby School District (British Columbia).
PUB DATE Feb 80
NOTE 44p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Foreign Countries; *Inservice Teacher Education; Mainstreaming; *Program Evaluation; Resource Teachers; Secondary Education; Secondary School Teachers; *Slow Learners; Special Education; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Improvement

ABSTRACT

The major objective of this evaluation was to determine whether "The Slow Learner in the Secondary Schools" program had any impact on the educational environment of the slower learners in Burnaby (B.C.). The objective of the program was to produce measurable impact regarding changes in the attitudes, instructional strategies, curriculum, and use of resource materials of the professional staff. The program provided for inservice education of special education and regular teachers such skills as preparing Individualized Educational Programs (IEP's), assessment of slow-learners, and use of available resources and resource persons. Evaluation data included interviews, a questionnaire, and a needs assessment survey. Though the most common provision for slow learners is referral to the Learning Assistance Center, the attitudes of regular classroom teachers did make a positive shift after program participation. (Author/BW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

School District No. 41 — Burnaby
5325 KINCAID STREET, BURNABY, B.C. V5G 1W2 TELEPHONE 299-0611

ED209274

AN EVALUATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SEQUENCE ON "THE SLOWER LEARNER IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL"

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
W.O. Marble
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FEBRUARY, 1980

W. O. MARBLE JR.

TM 810 767

Elmer E. Froese, B.A., Ed. D. Superintendent of Schools
Peter S. Boyle, C.A. Secretary-Treasurer
Olaf P. Rostad, B.A., Ed. D. Deputy Superintendent of Schools

Rationale

This evaluation was carried out in order to provide information to the Student Services Division of the Burnaby School Board as to the effectiveness of their inservice program for district personnel on "The Slower Learner in the Secondary Schools." The work was also done as part of the field work component of a doctoral program in educational evaluation.

Objectives of the Evaluation Study

One major objective of the evaluation was to determine whether the proposed program had any impact on the educational environment of the slower learners in the secondary schools in Burnaby. Another major objective of the program was to produce measurable impact regarding changes in the attitudes of professional staff, as well as changes in their instructional strategies, curriculum, and the use of resource materials.

Description of the Program Being Evaluated

At present, the trend within the Province and elsewhere is to educate the slower learner in regular classes with normal children. The Ministry has indicated how this might be accomplished and under what conditions.

> Whenever possible and appropriate, handicapped children are to be educated in regular classes with normal children. The most frequently quoted restriction applied to mainstreaming is probably that which defines mainstreaming as providing the most appropriate education for each child in the least restrictive setting. (Guidelines, 1979).

The program, "The Slower Learner in the Secondary School" was created to help secondary teachers in Burnaby upgrade existing skills and acquire new ones for teaching slow learners. Some examples of the skills to be upgraded are: identifying the slow learner, individualizing and grouping, accommodating the slower learner in the classroom, and gauging the most suitable degree of integration for a slow learner. Examples of skills to be acquired are: preparing Individualized Educational Programs (I.E.P.), assessment of slow learners, and resources and resource persons available to teachers of slower learners.

The Program provided for six sessions, ranging in length from two to seven hours, given over five weeks and totalling 29.5 hours. Of the total, 14 hours required relieving the participants from classroom duties and 15.5 hours were outside regular school hours. The maximum enrolment, set by the Program developers, was 20 participants. The participants were intended to be administrators, counsellors, special education teachers or regular teachers. A breakdown of actual participants is given in Table 1. There were no administrators or counsellors enrolled. Of the 11 secondary schools in the District, eight were represented. With the exception of Session V, sessions were relatively well attended (mean attendance excluding Session V was 71.0%). The session formats

were generally some form of information presentation by a resource person, followed by group activities and/or discussion. Session IV and V represented the only radical departure from the format. Session IV was open to all District personnel and was given, in large measure, by members of the Superintendent's staff. Session V was a display of resource materials. The introductory session identified the characteristics of the slower learner, mainstreaming and integration. Following sessions presented alternative instructional strategies and curricula, how to adapt curricula, available resources and materials, and developing Individualized Educational Programs. A description of each session is given in Figure 1. Some of the material and rationale for the Program was taken from the Trainer's Guide to Life Centered Career Education (Bronlin et al., 1978). This program, developed in the United States for mildly retarded teenagers, groups curriculum into three areas: daily living skills, personal social skills, and occupational guidance and preparation. The first session begaon on October 24, 1979 with sessions following at approximately one week intervals.

Table 1

A Breakdown of Program Participation

By Teaching Assignment

Administrator	0
Counsellor	0
Special Education Teacher	15
Regular Teacher	5

Figure 1

Topics Presented During Each Session

of the Program

Session I: Introduction

- Identifying the slower learner
- Defining mainstreaming
- Identifying models of delivery

Session II: Instructional Strategies

- Learning characteristics of slow learners
- Individualizing and grouping
- Accomodating slow learners
- Developing an instructional plan

Session III: Curricula for Slow Learners

- Identifying life skills
- Current curriculum projects in Burnaby
- Setting goals for slow learners

Session VI: Summary Session

- Familiarity with available resources
- Knowledge of resource requirements
- Gauging suitable degrees of integration

Evaluation Design

The evaluation was designed as an interrupted time series. Baseline data was collected during late September and early October of 1979 for the eleven secondary schools in Burnaby. These data identified the existing in-school educational environment of the slower learners within the District and were gathered prior to the beginning of the Program. Three types of information was gathered. First a set of interview questions and a follow-up questionnaire was prepared. These were used with administrators and teachers in each secondary school and provided information about the general school environment and operating procedures that could affect slower learners. To assess the level of need and the degree to which the need had been addressed by the District, a Needs Assessment Survey similar to that in the Trainer's Guide...(Bronlin et al., 1978) was given to participants at the beginning of the first session. The needs examined were needs relating to the slower learner. To measure the participants' knowledge, attitudes, and commitment toward slower learners, a Staff Development Scale was administered at the beginning and end of the Program. This instrument was developed by Larrives and Cook (1979) to study the attitudes of regular classroom teachers toward the mainstreaming of special needs children. The 30-item Likert-type instrument, it has a reported split-half reliability of 0.92. The scale was modified slightly to use more familiar local vocabulary. A copy of both instruments is contained in Appendix A.

An evaluation was also made of each of the six sessions to determine their effectiveness in meeting the objectives set for each session. A form of post-session assessment was used to gather information about the degree to which the Program achieved by rating the stated objectives on a

five-point scale. Evaluation forms for the sessions are included in Appendix D. The evaluation was also interested in identifying shifts in attitudes towards the education of slow learners by the participants. For this purpose the Needs Assessment Survey and the Staff Development Scale mentioned earlier were used.

This report contains the baseline data gathered during the pre-Program interviews, participant evaluations of the attainment of stated objectives for each session and for the overall program, as well as data on attitudinal changes towards slow learners that occurred over the length of the Program. The information contained in the report is presented in a number of sections. First, there is a discussion of in-school variables that might potentially affect the education of slower learners. These variables consist of population, grade levels, and services provided for slow learners, as well as the materials used for instruction. Next, is a review of Learning Assistance Centers, the experience and training of Learning Assistance teachers, physical features of centers, instructional setting, methods of referral, reporting and other factors affecting the performance of this service. The effects of the Program on the knowledge and attitudes of the Program participants. Finally a summary and recommendations are included.

In-school Variables

In the Burnaby school district, there are 11 secondary schools consisting of two senior secondaries (grades 11 and 12), one modified senior secondary (grades 10-12), two junior-senior secondaries (grades 8, 12), and six junior secondaries (grades 8 - 10). Table 2 shows the distribution of the provision of services for slower learners in the

secondary schools. It is important to distinguish between special classes and learning assistance. Special classes are groups of slower learners enrolled with a particular teacher from whom they receive most of their basic instruction. The students may be integrated into regular classes for some subjects, most often; fine arts, physical and industrial education. In the learning assistance center (L.A.C.) students are scheduled for specific, individualized help on a regular or sporadic basis. These students are often excused from attendance in particular classes to attend the L.A.C. All secondary schools make some provision for slow learners. Learning Assistance Centers are the most common service provided (90, 9%) though more than half the schools provide special classes (63.6%) either alone (9.1%) or in conjunction with L.A.C. (54.5%).

It is important to distinguish special classes from modified classes. Special classes are for students who are scoring two or more grade equivalents below their assigned grade level as measured on the Canadian Test of Basic Skills or an equivalent. Modified classes are for somewhat less academically able students than the average who, with some curricular and instructional modifications, can be successful in completing what is basically the regular secondary school program.

Table 2

Distribution of Services for Slower Learners

Reported by Number of Schools

Learning Assistance only	4
Special Class(es) only	1
Learning Assistance and Special Class(es)	6

Note: N=11

Another variable in the teaching of slow learners is the amount of instruction received by the students in English and mathematics. Among Burnaby secondary schools, the time allotments ranged from 30 to 60 minutes/day with an average of 41.4 minutes/day of instruction for both subjects across all schools. All schools allotted time equally for both subjects, though those times were often greater than that provided for other core subjects (e.g. social studies, science, and physical education).

The variables just discussed have been presented to show the variety of school size, grades, services provided, and instructional time within the secondary schools in Burnaby. While perhaps not important by themselves, they do give a reference when discussing the effect on instruction of the items that follow.

Material for Instruction

Teachers of slower learners use a wide variety of materials to meet the educational requirements of their students. Some of the most common reading and mathematics materials are listed in Tables 3 and 3b. The materials are listed in descending order of frequency of use. Most schools reported using a variety of materials.

Table 3a

Reading Materials For Slower Learners

With Frequency of Use by School

Title	Frequency
S.R.A. Reading Kits	5
Be A Better Reader Series	4
Scope Magazine	4
Scholastic Magazine	3
Action Magazine	2
Morphographic Spelling (S.R.A.)	2

Table 3b

Mathematics Materials For Slower Learners

With Frequency of Use by School

Title	Frequency
Individual Computational Skills Program	6
S.R.A. Mathematics Kits	3
Spectrum Mathematics Series	2

Learning Assistance Centers

As the learning assistance center concept features so prominently in Burnaby secondary schools (10 out of 11 schools), it is useful to examine this model of delivery of service in more detail. Where possible I have compared Burnaby's results with those in the recently published survey by Schwartz (1979) on Learning Assistance Centers in British Columbia. First, characteristics of the experience and training of the learning assistance teacher are presented. The average length of special education experience in Burnaby is 6.9 years (range: 1 - 11 years), while for the Province, only 9.6% had 6 or more years experience in special education and only 11.7% had 6 or more years in learning assistance. Average related experience of L.A. teachers in Burnaby is, then, considerably above the provincial average. In the provincial survey, 23.9% of L.A. teachers had Masters degrees or beyond in a related field of study such as special education, child development, diagnostic assessment etc. In Burnaby, the average (35.7%) exceeds the average for the province.

In Burnaby, with the exception of one school, students are on individual curricular programs, though there may be a number of students in the L.A.C. at a given time. The average class size in Burnaby secondary L.A.C.'s is 5.6 students, whereas the provincial average is 8.1 students. Clearly, Burnaby is somewhat lower than the provincial average.

The degree of use of the Individual Education Program (I.E.P.) is a measure of the degree of individualization of instruction in a L.A.C. In Burnaby, 36.3% of the L.A., teachers prepare I.E.P.'s for all students attending the L.A.C. compared to the provincial average of 38.2%. This difference is probably not significant. On average, the L.A. teacher sees

each student 3.5 periods/week for an across-schools average of 210.6 minutes/week. No provincial comparisons were possible on this dimension.

Now let us examine the role of the L.A. teacher in Burnaby secondary schools. On average 14.2% of the teachers have scheduled time for administering and evaluating diagnostic assessment instruments as compared to the provincial average of 8.6%. Approximately 16.7% have some regular specified time each day for consultation with staff and parents whereas the provincial average is 5.9%.

Another function of the L.A. teacher is to provide special individualized learning materials for use by the classroom teacher. In Burnaby, 71.4% of the L.A. teachers provide materials to regular teachers for an average of 38.3 students/school. In Burnaby, one-third of the schools use volunteer aides (approximately 25% parent volunteers, 75% peer tutoring). In the provincial survey, the use of volunteer aides in the L.A.C. was limited to peer tutoring (8.5% in the schools reporting).

Student referrals to Burnaby L.A.C. teachers come from many sources. Table 5 identifies those sources and their relative frequency. In the secondary school, staff (teachers and counsellors) account for over 90% of the referrals.

Table 5

Sources of Referrals to Learning Assistance

Source	Referrals
Subject teacher	58.0
Counsellor	32.5
Administrator	3.7
Parent	3.4
District	3.3

Note: All numbers are percentages.

Another important function of the L.A.C. teacher is reporting pupil achievement. The most common audiences for reporting is the principal, subject teacher and parent. Table 6 gives the methods of reporting and their relative frequency. A major part of the L.A.C. teacher's reporting is written and oral. The only provincial figures for comparison show that most reporting to parents is written and oral (46.4%) followed closely by written only (31.9%).

Table 6

Method and Frequency of Reporting by L.A. Teachers

Type of Reporting	Report Recipient		
	Principal	Subject Teacher	Parent
Oral and written	57.1	62.5	71.4
Written only	0	12.5	14.3
Oral only	28.6	25.0	14.3
No reporting	14.3	0	0

Note: All numbers are percentages.

All secondary schools in Burnaby have Department Heads. It is reasonable to expect that L.A.C. teachers would consider themselves as members of a particular department. For 83.3% of the L.A.C. teachers that is true. Membership is in the departments of English, social studies, mathematics, counselling and special education.

Program Effects

The Program, as mentioned earlier, was to improve the participants' skills for teaching slower learners and to change teacher attitudes towards the slower learner. Improvement in skill competencies were reported

by the participants at the end of each session as shown on the session evaluation forms in Appendix B. The discussion of the competency improvement is found later in this section. The Needs Assessment Survey was given at the beginning of the Program to all participants to determine deficiencies within the District for dealing with slow learners. This consisted of three components. First was the "Degree of Need" with a range from 1 (low need) to 3 (high need). Next is the "Status Within the District" with the same range. Finally, a "Need-Status Comparison" score was created to measure how closely the District was meeting the needs, as interpreted by the respondent. It was the ratio of "Status Within the District" to "Degree of Need". For this measure the range is from .3 (lowest) to 1 (highest). Table 7 contains a breakdown for each item in the Needs Assessment Survey. "Status Within the District" always rated lower than the respondent's judgement of need. Items 2, 3, 5, 8 and 18 showed a low Need-Status Comparison while some items were high (items, 1, 11, 12, 14).

Table 7

Breakdown by Statement and Category on

Needs Assessment Survey

Statement[1]	Degree of Need	Status Within District	Need-Status Comparison
1	2.6	2.2	.85
2	2.6	1.2	.46
3	2.8	1.4	.50
4	2.6	2.0	.77
5	2.4	1.4	.58
6	2.8	1.8	.64
7	3.0	2.0	.67
8	3.0	1.4	.47
9	2.8	1.8	.64
10	2.4	1.8	.75
11	2.4	2.2	.92
12	2.2	1.8	.82
13	2.8	2.0	.71
14	2.6	2.4	.92
15	2.6	1.8	.69
16	2.2	1.6	.72
17	3.0	1.8	.60
18	2.6	1.2	.46
19	2.8	1.8	.64

[1] Statements are given in the Needs Assessment Survey (appendix A)

To gauge the degree to which the participants felt the District was responding to the needs of slower learners (here called Congruence) examine Table 8. The responses for each participant on the Needs Assessment Survey for "Need" and "Status" was located in the matrix. High Congruence responses fall along a diagonal running from Low Need, Low Status to High Need, High Status. Overall congruences, calculated by the ratio of the sum of the high congruence cells (9+83+16 = 108) to the sum of all the cells (394) is 0.27. The maximum possible value for the congruence is 1.00. This rather low value (0.27) indicated a fair degree of dissatisfaction by the participants with the District's present attempts to provide for slower learners.

Table 8

A Factorial Table Comparing the Congruence Between Need and Status

		Degree of Need		
		Low	Moderate	High
Status	Low	9	16	100
Within	Moderate	9	83	151
District	High	4	6	16

The Staff Development Scale was the criterion used to detect changes in attitude towards slower learners during the Program and was given to the program participants at the beginning of the first session and the end of the sixth session. The means and t-test results for the regular classroom teachers and special education teachers are given in Tables 9 and 10. The results of the two tables show that special education teachers, statistically, were more positive ($p < .01$) towards slower learners at the beginning of the Program than the regular teachers. The improvement in attitude of the regular teachers was statistically significant ($p < .001$), though at the end of the Program they were marginally lower statistically ($p < .10$) than the special education teachers. Table 9 has some rather interesting comparisons. Using the standard deviations between pretest and posttest for regular classroom teachers, (8.09, 16.07) we see that at the end of the Program their attitudes as represented by scores of the Scale covered a wider range on the posttest. The small sample size (N=6) makes any interpretation of this result rather risky. The range of scores given in Table 11 shows that the scores for most regular teachers increased in a positive direction yet, in fact, some remained unchanged. No change was observed for the special education teachers, which might be interpreted as "preaching to the converted".

Table 9

Breakdown by Pretest/Posttest for

Staff Development Scale

		Pretest	Posttest
Teaching Assignment	Regular	85.50	91.83
		8.09	16.07
	Special	94.63	92.60
	Education	8.98	8.64

Note: Means are upper numbers, standard deviations are lower numbers. N=6 for regular teachers. N=14 (pretest) and 10 (posttest) for special education teachers.

Table 10

Summary of t-test Results Between

Pretest and Posttest Means on Staff Development Scale

Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest	t	p
Regular	Regular			10.490	.001
Regular		Special Education		3.840	.01
	Regular		Special Education	3.370	.1[illegible]
		Special Education	Special Education	.037	n.s.

Table 11

Range of Pretest/Posttest Scores

on Staff Development Scale

		Pretest	Posttest
Teaching Assignment	Regular	71-95	65-111
	Special Ed.	81-109	81-106

Note: Maximum score = 150

Most sessions of the Program were evaluated in two ways. First, the participants were asked to rate the same objectives for each session on the same five points. Each major objective was rated, by the participants, for how well the participants had achieved competency in the areas discussed in each particular session. For the rating scale for each session, participants were asked to use a Likert-type scale which was scored from 5 (most positive) to 1 (least positive). The choices for the scale are given in Appendix B. Table 12 contains the numerical ratings for each session. Three would be a "middle" rating. Any two mean values in the table are statistically significantly different ($p < .05$) if they differ by 1.2[1] or greater. With this in mind, we see that Session IV ranked below a number of the sessions on four of the five features considered. Its average rating was also significantly below Session II. Session V was a book and resource materials

[1]Using the largest standard deviation (.73) and the smallest sample size (N=8), a t-value of 2.3 ($p < .05$) would be obtained for a mean difference of 1.2.

display. There was no statistically significant difference between regular and special education teachers on the ratings.

Table 12

Participant Ratings of Five Features of Each Session

	1	2	3	4	5	6
Organization	3.8	4.5	3.8	3.3	4.3	3.0
Objectives	3.9	4.2	3.9	3.4	4.0	3.9
Work of Resource Person	4.1	4.6	4.1	3.0	4.0	4.1
Benefits of Participation	3.5	4.2	3.9	2.8	4.0	3.6
Balance Between	3.4	4.4	3.8	2.8	n.a.[1]	3.2
Average Rating	3.7	4.4	3.9	3.1	4.1	3.7

Note: Numbers are mean scores when rated on a five point scale.

[1]Session V was a book and materials display.

For all sessions, except Session IV and V, a number of key competencies were identified. At the end of each session, participants were asked to rate each competency from two perspectives: their improvement in the competency area as a result of the session, and their rating of the importance of the competency area. "Competency Improvement" is the change in the participants' rating using the scale, (1 = little improvement, 2 = some improvement and 3 = much improvement) of the objectives (competencies) for each session. For this ratio the range of possible values is from 0 to 2. No change in competency before and after a session would yield a "Competency Improvement" score of 0. "Competency Importance" was rated on a 3 point scale (1 = little importance, 2 = some importance, and 3 = much importance). Table 13 contains the results of the Competency Improvement and Importance for the competency areas. It appears that for competency improvement, the session on curriculum for slow learners, was the most successful, while the introduction session was the least. As no increases in competency improvement were beyond the value of 1.00, the increases were generally small. The competencies identified by the program developers seem to be those considered important by the participants as all Competency Importance values were greater than 2.00 (3 being the maximum value).

Table 13

Ratings of Mean Competency Improvement

And Mean Competency Importance

For Each Competency Area

Competency Area	Competency Improvement	Competency Importance
Session I		
1. Identifying slow learners[1]	.13	2.64
2. Understanding mainstreaming	.20	2.69
3. Models of delivery	.13	2.01
4. Assessment procedures	.33	2.36
5. Knowledge of I.E.P.'s	.14	2.21
Session II		
1. Learning characteristics	.47	2.88
2. Teaching strategies	.69	2.88
3. Individualizing & grouping	.25	2.44
4. Teaching considerations	.53	2.65
5. Developing an instructional plan	.18	2.71
Session III		
1. Identifying life skills	1.00	2.82
2. Current Burnaby programs	.70	2.53
3. Setting goals	.70	2.53
Session VI		
1. Familiarity with resouces	.62	2.77
2. Knowledge of resources needed	.58	2.50
3. Gauging the degree of integration	.75	2.58

[1]For the complete wording of each Competency Area see Appendix B.

At the end of Session VI an overall evaluation of the Program sessions was given (see Appendix C). This instrument attempted to determine the degree to which the participants felt the program met needs identified by the program developers. The participants were asked to score each need on a five-point scale (1 = no help, 5 = a great deal of help). Any two average values presented in Table 14 are statistically significant ($p < .05$) if the differ by 1.2 or greater. The only significant difference, objective 6 (or individualizing instruction) was addressed more effectively by the Program than the efforts in convincing teachers that slower learners can function in a regular classroom. All other values fell above the average value (3 = some help) and did not differ significantly from each other.

At the bottom of the overall evaluation sheet, a request for further suggestions was made. Three suggestions were made by the participants:

1. The participants should include administrators and counsellors along with special education and regular teachers.
2. The information given to the participants should be specific to subject(s) and grade level(s).
3. The program would be more effective if offered in the spring in order to stimulate new school year planning.

Table 14

Mean Ratings of Overall Program Goals

Program Goals	Mean Rating
1. Skills to deal with slower learners.[1]	3.7
2. Improved attitude toward slower learners.	3.8
3. Influence to provide better services to slower learners.	3.9
4. Provide better educational structure for lower learners.	3.3
5. Proved that slower learners can acquire competencies.	2.8
6. Improved efforts to individualize instruction.	4.0
7. Providing beneficial knowledge and materials.	3.9

[1] For the complete wording of each program goal See Appendix C.

Summary

At present, all Burnaby secondary schools make some form of special provisions for slower learners, the most common being the Learning Assistance Center. A majority also provide some form of segregated special classes, In the senior secondary school particularly, a large number of staff do not teach classes of slower learners. In the junior secondary schools, where academic streaming is less prevelant, most teachers teach some slow learners. The instructional time

for English and mathematics is generally equal and determined by the type of timetable used.

In Burnaby, Learning Assistance teachers are generally well experienced and trained. Though their assessment of students still relies heavily upon the Gates-McInitie Reading Test, a fairly wide range of other test are used. The learning assistance materials most commonly used are of the magazine series and "kit" format. The facilities are generally quite satisfactory. The amount of individualized instruction, as reflected in the degree of use of the I.E.P., is still quite low but appears to be increasing as teachers become aware of the benefits. Few learning assistance teachers have scheduled time for administering and evaluating tests, and consultation. One possible way to alleviate this lack of time, using volunteer aides, is not common within the District.

Most of the referrals to the learning assistance teacher (over 90%) come from subject teachers and counsellors. It appears that the classroom teacher is the most important person in identifying slower learners within the secondary schools. Reporting by learning assistance teachers appears to be very extensive with one exception. Some principals in secondary schools receive no form of report on students in the L.A.C. Oral reporting is still the most common form of in-school reporting.

While teachers in the Program rated the degree of need of the categories in the Needs Assessment high, they did not see the District staff as reflecting the same degree of need. Generally, they felt the District assigned a lower priority to most categories. Congruence between the District and the Program participants was perceived as greatest for items that could be described generally as teacher-related activities or behaviours.

Attitudes towards slower learners between the two groups of participants (regular and special education teachers) differed at the start of the Program, but not at the end. While the positive shift in attitude of regular teachers during the Program was statistically significant, it may have been depressed due to two particular outlier low scores. To effect attitude change it appears the Program, at least for the regular teachers, was a positive step. Whether it would be possible to positively affect the attitudes of other school personnel is not known.

The Program features common to each session were rated satisfactory. No extreme difficulties were uncovered and all the sessions, but one were judged equal. In addition, it appears that increases in the skills identified for each session, though small, were present.

References

Bronlin, Donn E., McKay, Donald J. & West, Lynda, L. Trainer's guide to life centered education. Virginia: The Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Guidlines to Special Education Programs 1979-80, Ministry of Education, Science and Technology, Victoria, B.C., 1979.

Larrivee, Barbara, Cook, Linda. Mainstreaming: A study of the variables affecting teacher attitudes. Journal of Special Education, 1979, 13(3), 315-324.

Learning Assistance in British Columbia; Its Forms; Its Function. Educational Research Institute of British Columbia, A. Schwartz, Project Director, Vancouver, B.C., 1979.

APPENDIX A

NEEDS ASSESSMENT SURVEY

Check ONE: ____Administrator ____Counsellor

____Special Ed. teacher ____Regular teacher

Directions: Listed on the following pages are possible needs which relate to the slower learner in the District. For each need statement do the following:

1. Rank each item on the first scale at the right of the page in terms of how important the need is in your opinion. Circle your choice.

   Key: 1= low need
   2= moderate need
   3= high need

2. Then rank each item on the second scale at the right of the page in terms of how well you believe the District is currently accomplishing the need. Circle your choice.

   Key: A= not accomplished at all
   B= partially accomplished
   C= completely or almost completely accomplished

WE, AS EDUCATORS, IN AN EFFORT TO OFFER QUALITY EDUCATIONAL SERVICES TO SLOWER LEARNERS:

1.	Need to integrate slower learners into regular classes.	need 1 2 3 status A B C
2.	Need to have written educational goals/ objectives for slower learners in the curriculum.	need 1 2 3 status A B C
3.	Need to establish a competency-based curriculum for slow learners	need 1 2 3 status A B C
4.	Need to provide career decision making experiences in the classroom for the slower learner	need 1 2 3 status A B C

5.	Need to involve parents in the education process of slow learners.	need 1 2 3 status A B C
6.	Need to involve available resources in the community.	need 1 2 3 status A B C
7.	Need to become knowledgeable about the nature of the slow learner in an effort to increase positive teacher attitiudes.	need 1 2 3 status A B C
8.	Need to learn specific instructional techniques for teaching slow learners.	need 1 2 3 status A B C
9.	Need to identify major sources of instructional materials/media for slow learners.	need 1 2 3 status A B C
10.	Need to identify a variety of effective assessment techniques for slow learners.	need 1 2 3 status A B C
11.	Need to learn how to effectively evaluate a program for slower learners.	need 1 2 3 status A B C
12.	Need to gain knowledge about the role of the teacher of slower learners.	need 1 2 3 status A B C
13.	Need to assist slower learners in acquiring daily living skills.	need 1 2 3 status A B C
14.	Need to infuse career information into the subject content for slow learners.	need 1 2 3 status A B C
15.	Need to identify any concerns which teachers may have about integrating slower learners into regular classes.	need 1 2 3 status A B C
16.	Need to identify ways regular classroom teachers can use special education teachers (L.A.C. etc.) to assist the slower learner in their classes.	need 1 2 3 status A B C

17. Need to identify appropriate educational support services that will enhance student learning.	need	1 2 3
	status	A B C
18. Need to have school staff involved in developing a plan for mainstreaming.	need	1 2 3
	status	A B C
19. Need administrative support relative to special needs students.	need	1 2 3
	status	A B C

STAFF DEVELOPMENT SCALE

Check ONE: ____Administrator ____Counsellor

____Special Ed. Teacher ____Regular Teacher

Directions: The following statements are designed to identify beliefs you have concerning the education of slow learners. There are no right or wrong answers. Circle one response which best describes how you feel about each statement.

Key: SA - strongly agree
A - agree
U - undecided, no opinion, neither agree or disagree
D - disagree
SD - strongly disagree

1. Many of the things teachers do with regular students in a classroom are appropriate for slow learners. SA A U D SD
2. The needs of slow learners can best be served through special, separate classes. SA A U D SD
3. A slower learner's classroom behaviour generally requires more patience from the teacher than does the behaviour of normal children. SA A U D SD
4. The challenge of being in regular classroom will promote the acedemic growth of the slow learner. SA A U D SD

5.	The extra attention slow learners require will be to the detriment of the other students.	SA A U D SD
6.	Mainstreaming offers mixed group interaction which will foster understanding and acceptance of differences.	SA S U D SD
7.	It is difficult to maintain order in a regular classroom that contains slow learners.	SA A U D SD
8.	Regular teachers possess a great deal of the expertise necessary to work with slow learners.	SA A U D SD
9.	The behaviour of slow learners will set a bad example for the other students.	SA A U D SD
10.	Isolation in a special class has a negative effect on the social and emotional development of a slow learner.	SA A U D SD
11.	The slow learner will probably develop academic skills more rapidly in a special classroom than in a regular classroom.	SA A U D SD
12.	Most slow learners do not make an adequate attempt to complete their assignments.	SA A U D SD
13.	Integration of slow learners will require significant changes in regular classroom procedures.	SA A U D SD
14.	Most slow learners are well behaved in the classroom.	SA A U D SD
15.	The contact regular-class students have with mainstreamed students may be harmful.	SA A U D SD

16. Regular-classroom teachers have sufficient training to teach slow learners. SA A U D SD
17. Slow learners will monopolize the teacher's time. SA A U D SD
18. Mainstreaming the slow learner will promote his/her social independence. SA A U D SD
19. It is likely that a slow learner will exhibit behaviour problems in a regular classroom setting. SA A U D SD
20. Diagnostic-prescriptive teaching is better done by L.A. or special teachers than by regular-classroom teachers. SA A U D SD
21. The integration of slow learners can be beneficial for regular students. SA A U D SD
22. Slow learners need to be told exactly what to do and how to do it. SA A U D SD
23. Mainstreaming is likely to have a negative effect on the emotional development of the slow learner. SA A U D SD
24. Increased freedom in the classroom creates too much confusion. SA A U D SD
25. The slow learner will be socially isolated by regular-classroom students. SA A U D SD
26. Parents of slow learners present no greater problem for a classroom teacher than those of a normal child. SA A U D SD
27. Integration of slow learners will necessitate extensive retraining of regular teachers. SA A U D SD
28. Slow learners are likely to create confusion in the regular classroom. SA A U D SD

29. Slow learners are likely to create confusion in the regular classroom. SA A U D SD

30. The presence of slow learners will promote acceptance of differences on the part of regular students. SA A U D SD

APPENDIX B

EVALUATION OF SESSION I

(Introduction)

Check ONE: ____Administrator ____Counsellor

____Special Ed. Teacher ____Regular Teacher

Directions: Read each item carefully and give your honest reactions to the mentioned concepts. Please respond to every item or statement.

1. The organization of Session I was:
   ____excellent ____good ____average ____fair ____poor
2. The objectives of this session were:
   ____very evident ____evident ____moderately evident
   ____slightly evident ____vaque
3. The work of the resource persons was:
   ____excellent ____good ____average ____fair ____poor
4. Participating in this session should prove to be:
   ____very beneficial ____beneficial ____moderately beneficial
   ____slightly beneficial ____not beneficial
5. The balance between theoretical and practical information was:
   ____excellent ____good ____average ____fair ____poor

Directions: Place checks to show your degree of competency development during Session I.

Competency Area	Competency BEFORE Session	Competency AFTER Session	Importance of the Competency
Identifying the slow learner.	____much ____some ____little	____much ____some ____little	____much ____some ____little
My understanding of the term mainstreaming.	____much ____some ____little	____much ____some ____little	____much ____some ____little
Identifying the various models of delivery.	____much ____some ____little	____much ____some ____little	____much ____some ____little

My understanding of procedures for assessment of slow learners.	____much ____some ____little	____much ____some ____little	____much ____some ____little
My understanding of what an I.E.P. is.	____much ____some ____little	____much ____some ____little	____much ____some ____little

EVALUATION OF SESSION II

(Instructional Strategies)

Check ONE: _____ Administrator _____ Counsellor

_____ Special Ed. Teacher _____ Regular Teacher

Directions: Read each item carefully and give your honest reactions to the mentioned concepts. Please respond to every item or statement.

1. The organization of Session II was:

   _____ excellent _____ good _____ average _____ fair _____ poor

2. The objectives of this session were:

   _____ very evident _____ evident _____ moderately evident

   _____ slight evident _____ vague

3. The work of the resource persons was:

   _____ excellent _____ good _____ average _____ fair _____ poor

4. Participating in this session should prove to be:

   _____ very beneficial _____ beneficial _____ moderately beneficial

   _____ slightly beneficial _____ not beneficial

5. The balance between theoretical and practical information was:

   _____ excellent _____ good _____ average _____ fair _____ poor

Directions: Place checks to show your degree of competency development during Session II

Competency Area	Competency BEFORE Session	Competency AFTER Session	Importance of the Competency
6. Knowledge of the learning characteristics of the slow learner.	___ much ___ some ___ little	___ much ___ some ___ little	___ much ___ some ___ little
7. Learning several new teaching strategies.	___ much ___ some ___ little	___ much ___ some ___ little	___ much ___ some ___ little

Competency Area	Competency BEFORE Session	Competency AFTER Session	Importance of the Competency
8. Classroom organization individualizing & grouping	___ much ___ some ___ little	___ much ___ some ___ little	___ much ___ some ___ little
9. Teaching considerations to accomodate slow learner characteristics.	___ much ___ some ___ little	___ much ___ some ___ little	___ much ___ some ___ little
10. My understanding of how to systematically develop an instructional plan.	___ much ___ some ___ little	___ much ___ some ___ little	___ much ___ some ___ little

EVALUATION OF SESSION III

(Curriculum for Slower Learners)

Check ONE: _____ Administrator _____ Counsellor

_____ Special Ed. Teacher _____ Regular Teacher

Directions: Read each item carefully and give your honest reactions to the mentioned concepts. Please respond to every item or statement.

1. The organization of Session III was:

   _____ excellent _____ good _____ average _____ fair _____ poor

2. The objectives of this session were:

   _____ very evident _____ evident _____ moderately evident

   _____ slightly evident _____ vague _

3. The work of the resource person was:

   _____ excellent _____ good _____ average _____ fair _____ poor

4. Participating in this session should prove to be:

   _____ very beneficial _____ beneficial _____ moderately beneficial

   _____ slightly beneficial _____ not beneficial

5. The balance between theoretical and practical information was:

   _____ excellent _____ good _____ average _____ fair _____ poor

Directions: Place checks to show improvement in your degree of of competency change as a result of this session. Also check your opinion of the importance of competency.

Competency Area	Change in Competency	Importance of Competency
6. Identifying skills that slow learners should have when they leave secondary school.	_____ much _____ some _____ little	_____ much _____ some _____ little
7. Knowledge of current slow learners curriculum programs in Burnaby.	_____ much _____ some _____ little	_____ much _____ some _____ little
8. Setting goals for slow learners.	_____ much _____ some _____ little	_____ much _____ some _____ little

EVALUATION OF SESSION IV

(Adapting Curriculum)

Check ONE: _____ Administrator _____ Counsellor

_____ Special Ed. Teacher _____ Regular Teacher

Directions: Read each item carefully and give your honest reactions to the mentioned concepts. Please respond to every item or statement.

1. The organization of Session IV was:

   _____ excellent _____ good _____ average _____ fair _____ poor

2. The objectives of this session were:

   _____ very evident _____ evident _____ moderately evident

   _____ slightly evident _____ vague

3. The work of the resource persons was:

   _____ excellent _____ good _____ average _____ fair _____ poor

4. Participating in this session should prove to be:

   _____ very beneficial _____ beneficial _____ moderately beneficial

   _____ slightly beneficial _____ not beneficial

5. The balance between theoretical and practical information was:

   _____ excellent _____ good _____ average _____ fair _____ poor

EVALUATION OF SESSION VI

Check ONE: _____ Administrator _____ Counsellor

_____ Special Ed. Teacher _____ Regular Teacher

Directions: Read each item carefully and give your honest reactions to the mentioned concepts. Please respond to every item or statement.

1. The organization of Session VI was:

   _____ excellent _____ good _____ average _____ fair _____ poor

2. The objectives of this session were:

   _____ very evident _____ evident _____ moderately evident

   _____ slightly evident _____ vague

3. The work of the resource persons was:

   _____ excellent _____ good _____ average _____ fair _____ poor

4. Participating in this session should prove to be:

   _____ very beneficial _____ beneficial _____ moderately beneficial

   _____ slightly beneficial _____ not beneficial

5. The balance between theoretical and practical information was:

   _____ excellent _____ good _____ average _____ fair _____ poor

Directions: Place checks to show improvement in your degree of competency change as a result of this session. Also check your opinion of the importance of the competency.

Competency Area	Change in Competency	Importance of Competency
6. Familiarity with the resources (persons & materials) available for teaching slower learners.	_____ much _____ some _____ little	_____ much _____ some _____ little
7. A knowledge of the resources needed to integrate slow learners into the regular classroom setting.	_____ much _____ some _____ little	_____ much _____ some _____ little
8. An understanding of how to gauge the most suitable degree of integration for specific slow learners.	_____ much _____ some _____ little	_____ much _____ some _____ little

EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

Directions: The following are statements about the program. Circle the response which best describes the degree to which you feel the program met the needs below.

Key: G = a great deal of help
C = considerable help
S = some help
L = little help
N = no help at all

To what extent has the Program:

1. Provided you with additional skills to deal more effectively with slower learners?	G	C	S	L	N
2. Influenced you in developing a more favorable attitude toward the potential and human worth of these students?	G	C	S	L	N
3. Influenced you to provide better services for the educational needs of these students?	G	C	S	L	N
4. Assisted you in providing better educational structure so these students can leave school better prepared to function in society?	G	C	S	L	N
5. Proved that these students can function in your classroom to acquire competency based curriculum?	G	C	S	L	N
6. Stimulated you to increase your efforts toward individualizing instruction for these students?	G	C	S	L	N
7. Providing inservice knowledge and materials that are beneficial in your classes?	G	C	S	L	N

Any suggestions that would improve the program?